

there is no credibility for sanctions at all in a command structure. If one is at the top, one is in charge and one is accountable for whatever happens throughout the ranks.

Among the conclusion and recommendations is one that says that "It is necessary to imbue human relations training in the Army training system as a doctrinal imperative." That is very strong, because a doctrinal imperative means when it is part and parcel of a mission, and the mission is incomplete unless it is part of that mission.

I was struck by a recommendation that the EO Programs had to be engineered to protect those who use it and ensure that those working in it are not stigmatized. That said to me that if one was in the EO part of the program, one was not in the regular Army, or at least one did not have the same respect as those who were. This says that those people must be given credit for what they are doing, take pride in it and do it well. And when it says protect those who use it, it implies that in fact what we know to be true was true, and that is that the EO Program just as well may not have been there when it came to matters of sexual harassment because it did not do its job.

According to this report, women did not feel that they could come and report the sexual harassment at all. That is a comment on a justice system that no one ever wants to hear. The report says that a command climate assessment down to company size units, at least annually, should take place. If that had taken place, if there had been annual assessments at the company level, then it seems to me sexual harassment, which included criminal conduct, could have been found out. Unless one is willing to go down to that level, of course one is not going to find out about sexual misconduct. People do not come out, salute, and then engage in sexual harassment.

We do not think that there needs to be a witch-hunt, but one can uncover these matters if we do our job, and I congratulate the Army on this report. We will be looking to see if they carry out the report with the strength that its language implies.

#### SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN THE MILITARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my Women's Caucus colleagues for calling this afternoon's series of special orders dealing with sexual harassment and discrimination in the U.S. Armed Forces.

The seriousness of this problem first came to light with reports of sexual harassment and violence at the Aberdeen Proving Ground in my own State of Maryland. Not only were these reports confirmed, but, regrettably, further investigation has revealed that they were only the tip of the iceberg.

In contrast to prior such scandals within the military, the Army, and Secretary Togo West,

deserve credit for their quick and serious response to these reports. The Army's Senior Review Panel on Sexual Harassment and the Inspector General's Special Inspection of Initial Entry Training concluded that sexual harassment is widespread, "crossing gender, rank, and racial lines," and that job discrimination is even more pervasive. Additionally, they found that "respect as an Army core value is not well institutionalized in the [Initial Entry Training] process."

Clearly, when 47 percent of military women experience unwanted sexual attention, when 15 percent experience sexual coercion, when 7 percent are victims of sexual assault, and the victims are not only afraid to report acts of misconduct against them, but also feel that their charges will go unheeded, the unit cohesion and personal respect necessary for peak military performance, and the defense of the Nation, are jeopardized.

As these two reports also make clear, these issues are complex, and cannot be resolved overnight. Nonetheless, we do expect the Army to undertake every possible effort to remedy these problems as quickly as possible, and to work to maintain a high standard of personal conduct for all of its soldiers and officers.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank my Caucus colleagues for calling this special order, and I also want to thank Congresswomen FOWLER and HARMAN, our Caucus members serving on the National Security Committee, for the work which they have done on this issue. I look forward to continuing to work with them, as well as the Chairman of the Military Personnel Subcommittee, Mr. BUYER, on gender issues in the military. I look forward to the hearings which the subcommittee will hold on this issue in October, to learn more specifically what actions the Army will take to correct its personnel problems, and what we in Congress can do to assist in their implementation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. SLAUGHTER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### KEEPING COSTS DOWN: COMPETITION AMONG VENDORS FOR PROCUREMENT OF POSTAL UNIFORMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STRICKLAND] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this afternoon to talk about an issue that is of great concern not only to myself but to other Members of this body.

Under our current system, the United States Postal Service allows employees of the service to choose where to purchase their uniforms. Consequently, literally hundreds of small manufacturing companies and vendors from throughout this country are now supplying these needed uniforms on a choice basis to those who work for the Postal Service.

My concern and the concern of many of my colleagues is that the Postal Service is contemplating a change of policy, and rather than working with these large number of vendors and manufacturers, they are contemplating the selection of a single large vendor that would take over the responsibility for the procurement of postal uniforms.

Now, why does this concern me? The Postal Service contends that such a change in policy would save them money. My concern is that it would cost American jobs. I believe that the Postal Service should be required to purchase uniforms that are American-made, and that they should only purchase uniforms from companies which uphold and maintain certain high standards for the way they treat their workers and the fact that they are good corporate citizens.

In my district, in the small town of Nelsonville, OH, we have Rocky Shoes, Rocky Shoes and Boots, and a significant percentage of Rocky Shoes and Boots' business goes to provide shoes for those who work for the Postal Service. It is a good deal for Rocky Boots, and I believe it is a good deal for the men and women who work for our Postal Service.

So it troubles me that an institution, an agency such as the postal system which currently is very profitable and is realizing significant yearly profits, would in the name of cost savings take action which could cost my constituents and the constituents of many other Members of this body their livelihoods and their jobs.

Now, nearly 70 Members of this body have signed letters to the postal system and the Postmaster General expressing our concern about this proposed policy. I am happy with the fact that the postal system has at least temporarily put a moratorium on this proposed policy change. I remain concerned, however, that in the name of cost savings and efficiency, an action could be taken and is currently under consideration that would be very, very damaging to working men and women and working families in this country.

I believe that the best way to realize cost savings is to maintain a system where there is fair competition, where small manufacturers and vendors must compete for the business, rather than placing this responsibility in the hands of a single large vendor. Over 100 manufacturers and over 800 vendors are at risk.

So I come to the floor this evening to express in this venue my concern for this proposal and to ask Members of this body to join me as we request a